

It seems that the desire for more centralized form of media is being justified by the argument that the mass media is the same as the specialized Internet based or smaller news distribution media.

There is a difference between mass media and the alternative, small distribution media. It has to do with active vs. passive participation by the viewer. You need to go out and actively find the alternative news sources. This, in effect, does not give a fair and balanced presentation to the public. If all the easy viewing/listening/reading is the same (and of the same bias), there will be a perception that there is no dissent on a particular issue, especially if that issue is one that has a significant impact on the interests of that media.

This issue is a prime example of the effect of media ownership. Unless I went to an Internet site that told me about the details of this issue, I never would have known about it. It has not been covered in any depth by the mass media, simply because a positive outcome is in their favor.

I urge you to keep the restrictions in place on media ownership. Big business and the principles for which it stands are directly in opposition to a free, lively, and democratic society.

Mark Huston